

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/660,747	WILLIAMS ET AL.	
	Examiner Nicholas Augustine	Art Unit 2179	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nicholas Augustine.

(3) Matthew Ricciardi.

(2) Jon Grossman.

(4) Weilun Lo.

Date of Interview: 31 January 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 7.

Identification of prior art discussed: Sorokin et al..

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

WEILUN LO  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an  
Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: An agreement was reached of the distinction between the prior art and the immediate application and if properly supported by the specification the proposed amendments discussed between the Applicant and the Examiner might overcome the prior art relied upon. Applicant provided further clarification on the interpretation of the claim language and pointed out how the proposed amendments might overcome the prior art relied upon. The Examiner notes that the discussion of the prior art rejection along with the proposed amendments will require further consideration and an updated search. The Examiner agrees to accept figures 1-6 that were inadvertently filed in application serial number 10/660751.